DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 840 HE 029 690

AUTHOR Peltason, J. W.
TITLE Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana.
PUB DATE 18 Oct 95
NOTE 65p.; Papers presented at the David Dodds Henry Lectures in Higher Education (17th, Urbana-Champaign, IL, October 18, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Administration; College Planning; College Presidents; *Educational Economics; Educational Equity (Finance); Faculty College Relationship; *Financial Needs; *Financial Support; Fund Raising; Governance; Higher Education; Innovation; Participative Decision Making; *Public Support; Research and Development; Research Utilization; Resources; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Technology Transfer

ABSTRACT

This monograph is a transcript of a lecture given by Jack W. Peltason and the four responses by panelists from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. After a brief eulogy to David Dodds Henry, President of the University of Illinois (1955-71), the talk turns its focus to two decades of crisis for higher education--the 1960s and the 1990s. The changes that came out of the early revolution, which centered on student power, civil rights, the anti-war movement, and feminism, are seen to have strengthened colleges and universities. But public higher education in the 1990s is facing other threats: chronic underfunding; a wave of public and media criticism; "the illusion of the quick fix"; and the breakdown in the university system of shared governance. To meet these challenges, the following actions are proposed: improved efficiency in managing scarce resources; a focus on academic quality; a search for new sources of funding; and, finally, acceleration of the transfer of new knowledge to the marketplace. The panelists, James D. Anderson, John E. Cribbet, Eldon L. Johnson, and Silvia Manning, generally agree with the premises set forth in the lecture, although their concerns focus mainly on the lack of funding and public support. Following the four formal responses, the panelists and Dr. Peltason responded to questions from the audience. (CH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 401 840

Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary

by J. W. Peltason

President Emeritus, University of California

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.W. Peltason

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Seventeenth David Dodds Henry Lecture

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

HE 029 670

The David Dodds Henry Lectures in Higher Education are endowed by gifts to the University of Illinois Foundation in recognition of Dr. Henry's contributions to the administration of higher education, including his career as president of the University of Illinois from 1955 until 1971. The lectures are intended to focus upon the study of the organization, structure, or administration of higher education, as well as its practice. Selection of persons to present the lectures is the responsibility of the chancellors of the two campuses of the University. Presentation of the lectures is alternated between Chicago and Urbana-Champaign.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary

DAVID DODDS HENRY

President, University of Illinois

1955-71

Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary

by J. W. Peltason

President Emeritus, University of California

Seventeenth David Dodds Henry Lecture

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

October 18, 1995

Produced for the Office of the President by the Office of Publications, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Frontpiece by Jack Davis. 96 10M
The University of Illinois is an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution.

Contents

Welcome, President Stukel

1

Tribute to David Dodds Henry, Eldon L. Johnson

3

Preface, Paul W. Thurston

7

Introduction, Chancellor Aiken

10

Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary

J. W. Peltason

11

Response, James D. Anderson

31

Response, John E. Cribbett

35

Response, Eldon Johnson

39

Response, Sylvia Manning

43

Questions and Discussion

48

Welcome

Good afternoon. It's been twenty-three years since the first David Dodds Henry Lecture was held. Clark Kerr, the dean of modern American university thought, was the first speaker. Since then, an impressive array of higher education thinkers has followed: David Riesman, Hanna Gray, Linda Wilson, Walter Massey, and Don Langenberg, a former UIC chancellor and now president of the sprawling University of Maryland system. Each Henry lecturer brought his or her unique perspective to the series. But a common thread weaves through them all: that theme is change—more precisely, how American universities must change what they do and how they do it. The "R" words appear and reappear in the sixteen lectures held to date: retrenchment, reappraisal, reshaping, revisited. And today, thanks to Jack Peltason, we have both reaction and revolution.

Today's lecture, as all the Henry lectures, bears witness to one of the defining characteristics of David Henry himself. He believed that higher education administration was itself a genuine and legitimate endeavor. It is, he said, "a specialty whose study is as exacting in knowledge as medicine, as central to effective operation as law, as sensitive to human relations as government." That insight, my friends, is why David Henry was one of this University's greatest presidents and why the Board of Trustees and the University Foundation were wise to create the Henry lectures to honor him. I knew David Henry both by reputation and through correspondence; I planned to spend time with him in Florida this coming winter, and I regret that opportunity is forever gone. But it is impossible to spend much time at this University without hearing how his vision is responsible for so much of what the University of Illinois is today—including the Chicago campus, the arts and entertainment facilities here in Urbana-Champaign, the emphasis

on integrity and academic freedom that allowed the University to thrive in spite of the so-called Red Scare, and the agitation surrounding the war in Vietnam. It was a noisy time, and David Henry was a quiet man.

One of his colleagues and friends is Eldon Johnson, a former vice president at this University, who joined David Henry past the midway point of his sixteen years as president. Dr. Johnson is an Indiana native who received his Ph.D. degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1939. He held academic and administrative posts at the University of Oregon and the University of New Hampshire, where he was president from 1955 to 1962.

James J. Stukel

President

University of Illinois

10

A Tribute to David Dodds Henry

Many possible tributes could be inspired by the life of David Dodds Henry. Mine is aided by our forty-year association; our post-retirement letters, calls, and visit; and his memoirs, most fittingly entitled *Recollections in Tranquility*.

I have often wished for a study of his career to determine the secrets of his successes so that the lessons learned could be shared with others. He was indeed a model worth emulating. There are paradoxes to study, too. With his modesty, deliberation, civility, and dignity, how could he achieve what he did without any aggressive traits? Without fitting many of the stereotypes of a top executive—himself lamenting in his memoirs that he lacked a colorful presence and a gift of oratory—how could he so inspire confidence universally and move into top leadership in the five organizations most influential in national educational affairs, an achievement without parallel? And with his abhorrence of that most undignified business called "lobbying," how could he be so effective in it and enjoy the greatest confidence of governors and legislators? And what were those periodic meetings with the w'hole Illinois Congressional delegation in the nation's capitol?

Those of us who knew Dr. Henry well regarded him as a model university president because he had the essential attributes. Some of us would start the list not with technical qualifications, but with personality and character traits, like integrity. He was integrity personified. In the vernacular, what you saw was what you got. He was genuine, trustworthy, and predictable on principle, which he never sacrificed.

The president should keep his eye on the Big Picture—planning it, articulating it, settling direction. More than once in his memoirs he said he spoke publicly about virtually nothing except higher education, the priority

of its welfare, and its specific needs. His conceptualization of the future is most dramatically shown by the University's impressive presence in Chicago as one of the nation's great urban universities, the expansion in medical education both in Chicago and downstate, and the development of the multicampus system.

This is a reminder that the university president must be able to delegate, as was done on a grand scale in putting the administration of each campus under a chancellor. Another masterful plan of delegation was the division of labor between him, keeping the Big Picture, and Provost Lyle Lanier, managing and coordinating the parts—so skillfully that it was rarely noted.

The president must know the difference between what is public and what is private, and what is personal and what is institutional. Failure so to know has been the graveyard of many presidencies. It easily leads to abuse of power, the proper use of which is the ultimate presidential test. This offered no problem for Dr. Henry. He took pride in representing the University of Illinois as a great institution but he knew that the recognitions he received, including twenty-nine honorary degrees, derived from the University as well as from himself. He once said he cherished most the honor bestowed on him when he was called back to be given "emeritus" status as former president of Wayne State University. It was obviously given to him quite personally, David Dodds Henry, not in recognition of an institution in back of him somewhere. He often said he was at the right place, at the right time, with the right staff, with whom he always generously shared credit for achievement.

A university is a large bureaucracy necessarily, but its chief ingredient is its people. Our model showed this awareness in his hostility to organization charts—"putting people in boxes," he said. They needed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

latitude for their talents, with rewards and words of encouragement. And he said we did not need to meet every disappointment with: "There ought to be a policy on that!"

Another part of the Big Picture is the executive responsibility for leadership in keeping a balance in the multipurpose mission of the university. Dr. Henry spoke out eloquently for what would otherwise be neglected: the last part of the trilogy of teaching, research, and public service. The billions of dollars of public investment in aggregating great reservoirs of talent on the campuses should not be lavished on the fortunate students alone, to the neglect of off-campus education and of aid in the solution of societal problems.

Also, from his skilled performance, we can learn some of the negatives of presidential administration: don't ever speak without knowing it is in the public domain, subject to public scrutiny; don't sacrifice principle for expediency; don't confuse corporation and customers with university and students; and above all, don't lose confidence in students, who are our only future.

Unfortunately, this public man overshadowed the private man, largely unknown outside his family and a few intimate friends. His *Recollections*, which significantly bears a photo of the three beloved great-grandchildren, speaks eloquently of Sara as his "coed" bride, her dramatic and teaching talents, and her public service as first lady; and of "our happiest memories" of family retreats to the Michigan lakes, where son David took his first steps. Later, the grandsons would be creating cherished memories of visits to the "big house," the presidential mansion, into which the family had moved with the characteristic determination revealed in his four words: "to avoid all ostentation." Also, too little known to the public, this private man had an excellent sense of humor. Once near the end of the

student disruptions in the 1960s, I took to him a cartoon showing a student writing a note at a desk behind a door marked "President," saying: "Dear Mom: I am writing this as we occupy the President's office." He read it slowly, then called me by my first name, saying sharply, "Do you think that's funny?" Then he broke into a smile and next a hearty laugh.

Dr. Henry once paraphrased someone who said that the way to become a great president is to become president of a great university and then stay there a long time. He did come to a great university. He stayed with it a long time. He left it much greater—the important missing part of the cynical joke. To a "Book of Letters" for him when he retired twenty-four years ago, I contributed this sentence: "As Gregory and Peabody set and nurtured the University of Illinois as a seedling, you in your sixteen years have brought the tree to its branching out with unprecedented harvest." We, the state, and nation are still the fortunate beneficiaries, filled with special gratitude.

Eldon L. Johnson
Vice President, Emeritus
University of Illinois

PREFACE

It is fitting, in ways not known when invited, that Jack Peltason is the seventeenth David Dodds Henry lecturer. Freshly retired as president of the University of California system, he returns to this campus in October of 1995 to speak on a topic to which he has dedicated the larger portion of his life, higher education administration. Like Dr. Henry at the time of his retirement, Peltason is one of the most highly respected administrators of his generation. Peltason's administrative career began when President Henry chose him as dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at this campus, the circumstances of which he recounts with humor and sentiment. When told that Peltason would be the seventeenth Henry lecturer, Dr. Henry was very pleased. To the sadness of the campus community, Dr. Henry died several days before the lecture. Jack Peltason here provides a personal glimpse of President Henry, his mentor and friend. He goes on to discuss his concerns about the future of higher education in the United States.

After praising the system of higher education in the United States, where today more than 17 million students attend 3,000 institutions, Peltason recounts the tumultuous 1960s, a time of revolution on campuses all over the country. From those revolutions, he says, administrators learned the value of institutional neutrality, a trait which must be maintained if colleges and universities are to remain autonomous. American institutions of higher learning were strengthened, he contends, from these revolutions.

Peltason believes that colleges and universities can be strengthened from the revolutions now occurring in the 1990s, which he believes may be even more threatening than those weathered in the 1960s. He describes the revolutions of the 1990s in fiscal terms and cautions that they could lead to

mediocrity accompanied by a two-tiered system of higher education. Underfunding, public criticism of administrator shortsightedness, advocacy of "quick fixes," and undermining of the shared governance system of administration—all of these, Peltason believes, threaten the existence of high quality colleges and universities as we know them.

Peltason suggests that administrators of higher education address these revolutions in four ways: by improving efficiency in managing scarce resources, reviewing priorities, focusing on academic quality, and increasing funding. As he addresses each of his suggestions, he gives examples of just how administrators could accomplish it. To improve efficiency, he urges administrators daily to review and improve every job performed on a campus—from lawn mowing to lecturing. To review priorities, he proposes that all viewpoints must be considered. To focus on academic quality, he recommends his own method: before every administrative decision, ask if the proposed policy will help a student learn, a professor teach, or bring a new perspective or intellectual discovery to light. Finally, new sources of support for higher education, Peltason believes, will come only by convincing taxpayers that the money they provide for higher education is a good investment. He argues that this can be done by increasing the rate at which knowledge is transferred from the research university to the marketplace.

With these, Peltason ended his reactionary thoughts. His final words are words of hope, expressing a belief that higher education will recognize its threats and address them through "enlightened dedication to the common interest."

This monograph commemorates the dialogue which took place at this public lecture. Following Jack Peltason's lecture are four responses by

administrators and scholars from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, questions from the audience, and responses to these questions.

Paul W. Thurston, *editor*
Professor and Head
Department of Educational Organization
and Leadership
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Introduction

It is a great honor to introduce to you Dr. Jack Peltason. As many of you know, Dr. Peltason has enjoyed a long and distinguished career in university administration. We are fortunate at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign that a substantial amount of that time he served as chancellor of this institution. Until a few weeks ago, Dr. Peltason served as president of the University of California. He retired from that position at the end of September, and I am certain faculty and staff of that nine-campus system are as saddened about his departure as I am told this campus was when he left here in 1977.

Dr. Peltason is a true champion of higher education, fighting to maintain quality and access to students, despite economically challenging times. His address to you today is entitled "Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary." Please join me in welcoming Dr. Jack Peltason.

Michael Aiken
Chancellor
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary

J. W. Peltason

President Emeritus, University of California

President Henry, as he will always be known by me—although on less formal occasions I sometimes found it appropriate to address him as Dr. Henry—was my mentor and friend. I hope you will not think it presumptuous of me if I put my admiration and respect for him into the form of a personal anecdote or two.

In 1960 I had just been made a full professor at the University of Illinois and had no prior administrative experience. I had served as chair of the senate committee on English and found that assignment of some interest, but I had no great involvement with the academic senate. There was an opening for dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences because the then very powerful and popular dean, Lyle Lanier, had just been made provost. I had no thought of becoming the dean and had no claim to the position whatsoever; it just never entered my mind as a possibility. We were ready to take a sabbatical year in England and had our reservations on the *Queen Elizabeth*—or maybe it was the *Queen Mary*. In any event, sometime in the spring I was in the elevator of Lincoln Hall when a senior professor from the History Department said to me, "I did not know you had been an undergraduate at the University of Missouri." That seemed a rather odd remark to come out of the blue, but I thought no more of it until the next

day, when another senior professor, I think this time from the English Department, said to me, "How did you like being a graduate student at Princeton?" I still didn't have any clues until somebody in my department told me that these two professors were on the search committee for the new dean.

Then a call came from the office of the president of the University: Would I come see the president the next day? And so I met the always gracious President Henry, a man I had not known and about whom I had the same prejudices that all faculty have about all presidents, then and since.

He asked me why I thought I might make a good dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. I said I had never even thought about it in my whole life, that I hadn't the slightest idea what deans do, that I was not even sure I understood what they did in all those "ologies" on the other side of the campus. We had a pleasant talk at the end of which he said he was going to take a chance, if I would, and he offered me the deanship on the spot. He suggested that I confer with the search committee, whose chair, Ed Davidson, took over the responsibility of persuading me to take this adventuresome step. When I told President Henry I would do so, provided he could wait until the fall so that we could have a summer in Europe in lieu of the Fulbright, he agreed. But he asked me to keep my appointment a secret until it could be confirmed by the Board of Trustees. For two weeks I had to avoid friends and dissemble when they asked about the Fulbright. Those were the good old days when you could keep secrets. I will never forget that when I came out from the Board of Trustees meeting after my appointment had been confirmed in closed session—but just before it was to be announced—two of my colleagues came up to me in the halls of the Illini Union and asked, "Do you know who is going to be the new dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences?" When I said, I am," they laughed. While they were still laughing, President Henry came out of the room and

put his arm around me, and you could see the smiles come off their faces as it dawned upon them that indeed this kid was the new dean.

That night, as our friends called to congratulate me, the common theme was "You're so young and inexperienced to become a dean." By the eleventh call, I answered, " Jack Peltason, boy dean," only to discover that it was a news reporter who headlined her story the next day, "Jack Peltason, boy dean."

During the four years President Henry and I worked together, I never saw him other than quiet, committed, and concerned. I learned much from him, and not the least was that sometimes one had to choose between being effective and being loud, and that academic leadership is best measured by an ability to make it possible for faculty and students to engage in teaching and learning, rather than to get personal attention. I can't remember precisely if it was during that four years or some time before, but one incident has always stayed with me as an example of the difference between leadership defined as speechmaking and leadership defined as getting things done. We had a requirement in those days that all men students must take two years of compulsory ROTC, a requirement that could only be changed by legislation. The faculty recommended that it be abolished. President Henry could have championed that recommendation and made ringing speeches why such a requirement was no longer appropriate for a modern university, the results of which would have been to make him a local hero but most likely would have led to no action in Springfield. Instead, he went quietly to Springfield, talked to the leadership, discussed it with the governor, explained it to the veterans' organization, and without any fanfare, the law was repealed.

During the 1960s, when the campus was in turmoil and I was getting a lot of heat, he left decisions to me and in no way tried to second-guess

what I did; he really made the chancellorship system work. He also taught me a lot about being an ex-president. When he retired from the presidency and joined the faculty of the Urbana-Champaign campus, he carefully avoided being quoted or involved in any way that wasn't supportive and helpful.

It has very special meaning for Suzanne and me, therefore, that as I close out my active service as a member of the community of higher education, my first post-retirement assignment is to give a David Dodds Henry Lecture at the University of Illinois. If you will allow just one more personal reference, I would like to point out that after four years here I was lured away to the University of California, Irvine, to help build a new campus, and it was from there that I returned to become chancellor here and via Washington back to California. I have been very proud of the fact that I have had the opportunity to serve two great universities, and that having left the service of each of them once, I was invited back by each. I have also noted that it is fortunate that it is neither illegal nor immoral to be in love with two universities at the same time.

To the subject at hand:

There are more than 3,000 institutions of higher education in the United States, each of whose president or chancellor gives at least three speeches a year, and each of whose deans—and there are at least five for each institution—gives at least two speeches, producing a minimum annual output of 45,000 talks about higher education each year. In addition, every newspaper and magazine now has an education editor, each of whom produces a feature every Sunday explaining what is wrong with the world of higher education. Perhaps never before in the history of this nation, or any other nation, have so many people talked so much and—I may be a bit cynical—said so little about higher education.

I have been guilty myself of adding to this noise about higher

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

education, including contributing some decibels in the form of three inaugural addresses. In preparation for these comments, I went back and read my three inaugural addresses, one in the 1960s, one in the 1980s, and one in the 1990s. I discovered that I have been saying about the same thing over these last three decades. Although I am, as I have said in these speeches, a born optimist and a paid Pollyanna, I note that a common theme is the threats to our universities. Over these last three decades, the attacks upon higher education have come from different sources and have stemmed from different incidents, but my response to them has been traditional.

I have taken the view over this period—and persist in it—that while of course there are things that can and need to be done to improve universities, they are not fundamentally flawed. They are not broke; they don't need fixing; they need funding. And that is why my comments today are those of a reactionary.

But my comments are also those of a revolutionary in that I've lived through several revolutions in higher education, most notably those of the 1960s. So I'd like to focus my talk today on two decades of crisis for higher education, the 1960s and the 1990s, and tell you why I am even more concerned about American higher education today than I was in the era of sit-ins and nonstop protest. I regret that I am ending my academic career on such a pessimistic note, but am comforted by the fact that throughout history the older generation tends to believe that the world is going to hell. It may be nature's way of telling us that it is time to retire and to make us less unhappy about that fact.

Stop just for a moment and think what Americans have put into place over the last several centuries. For more than 200 years we have built a higher education system in this country premised on a few simple but powerful ideas. One is that our colleges and universities would be allowed

to develop at their own pace and in their own way, free from any central control. Another is that higher educational opportunity thrives best in a system with a diversity of institutions, from small liberal arts colleges to large research universities so that students have the widest possible range of educational options to choose from. A third is that education should serve as a path to social and economic mobility for those who lack inherited wealth, which is, of course, most of us. Still another is that we would avoid a two-track system of higher education—good institutions for the rich, mediocre ones for the poor—that has locked so many people around the globe into the social and geographical niche into which they happened to be born.

Today 17 million Americans are attending 3,000 institutions of higher education, more than 6 million of them on a full-time basis. Some Europeans laugh at our use of the term "college" for postsecondary institutions that wouldn't pass muster as high schools in England or Germany. But, like our willingness to assume that everyone has the right be called a gentleman or a lady, American tolerance for widely varying academic quality among our institutions is a reflection of our egalitarian traditions and the way in which we have used education to broaden opportunity for our people. Somewhere within our system there is a college or university education suited to the talents, aspirations, income, and academic preparation of just about everyone who has the motivation to seek it out. And nobody "owns" our colleges and universities. They are trusts that belong to all of us. We have church-operated institutions that provide an education from the perspective of almost every religion in the world. And then there are great state universities, of which I am especially fond. For people who want the excitement of being involved with a faculty who are responsible not only for teaching political science but developing it, not only for teaching chemistry but for being chemists, who are expected not

merely to teach in classrooms but to bring their knowledge into the marketplace, then the universities of Illinois, Michigan, and California provide them with an environment where the young and old from all over the world come to study all kinds of things and—if they are lucky—become involved in a whirlwind of intellectual excitement.

These research universities, along with their companions in the independent sector, are not only engines for the education of our young. They have also become the knowledge factories on which we depend for our future wealth. As we move into the next century, our very ability to generate wealth will depend upon knowledge, so that it can truly be said, that as the Universities of Illinois and California and Stanford, Harvard, Wisconsin, and so on go, so goes the economic well-being of this nation.

This is what we have done. This is the system we have built. It works. It has proven its flexibility and resilience over more than three decades of crisis and challenge and change. The 1960s were times of social unrest and campus disturbances. I still have no satisfactory explanation of why we went through such a turbulent period in our colleges and universities. No institutions escaped—not small ones, not big ones, not those with research emphasis, not those without, not historically black colleges. The troubles were so serious that real questions arose about our ability to keep the educational process going. In some places, as at the University of Illinois, keeping the campus open required calling in the National Guard twice and the State Police three times. And whenever there was trouble, the administration was blamed—either because they called the police too soon or did not call them soon enough, or because the campus was too liberal or too conservative. Then the explanation was unhappiness with the Vietnam war—but of course there was trouble in French and German and Italian universities too, places where the Vietnam war was not a major issue.

The fact is that during the 1960s we had a series of revolutions—student power, civil rights, anti-war, feminism. Universities were under attack from all sides, from constituencies outside the university and within. From inside, the charges were that the universities were not responsive enough to student concerns and that they were part of the war machine. From outside, the criticism was that universities were no longer institutions of learning, but were being used by faculty and students to promote political and social causes.

At the time, I tried to respond to both of these attacks. To those who thought that we were failing to stand up to the students and to maintain order, I tried to point out that universities are by their very nature noisy institutions and their greatest strength is providing students with chances to question and argue and debate and engage in peaceful protest.

On the other side, I rejected then, as I do now, the notion that members of the university community—those of us who are its professors and administrators and students, or I might add regents or trustees—have any right to use the university as an institution to promote our own particular political and social views, no matter how dear and important they are to us.

Our universities need, and by and large are given, considerable immunity from direct political accountability. We were given this protection from day-by-day accountability by those who provide the funds so that faculty can teach and students can learn, not so that they can use the university in its corporate capacity for our own political causes.

In my judgment, the price of autonomy for institutions and academic freedom for faculty is institutional neutrality. A university cannot have it both ways. Or, as I once put it, we know we are in trouble when the academic senate starts acting like the state senate and the state senate starts acting like the academic senate.

We weathered that storm in the 1960s, and even though there were legislative investigations, threats to cut the funds, and critical editorials from both the left and the right, our system of higher education emerged with its autonomy intact.

We did make some revolutionary changes in the 1960s however, which in my judgment substantially strengthened our colleges and universities.

We abandoned segregation in the South and all over the United States. Over the next three decades we started to put into place what came to be called affirmative action. We concluded that after centuries of discrimination it was not enough merely to stop discrimination and to assume that minorities and women would be able to walk through the doors of opportunity.

Programs such as Project 500 changed the character of our universities forever. Three decades later we may argue about which tools to use, but there is no argument about the need to act vigorously—or if you will affirmatively—to see to it that minorities are brought into the mainstream of higher education.

The civil rights revolution stimulated the feminist revolution. We altered the nature of the relationship between our colleges and universities and our women students and faculty and staff and changed the role of women in the academy. I can think of no other social revolution that came on so fast and that has had such profound and lasting consequences on everything we do. When I became chancellor here in 1967, we were still locking women up in their dormitories at ten o'clock in the evening. Not long after that, President Henry and I, talking about the next day's agenda before the Board of Trustees, reflected with some bemusement that who would have ever thought two grown men were about to go before the Board of Trustees to recommend to them that parents be allowed to decide if their children would be given the option of living in residence halls where the

students could choose to have what we then euphemistically called limited visitation rights, if their parents so wished. (The board, by the way, after extended discussion decided to leave the matter to the discretion of the chancellor.)

In the 1960s the rules of nepotism were being used to deny women employment. I remember the first time we actually gave tenure to a woman whose husband was also a tenured professor. (Somehow it was always assumed that if only one relative could be employed it would be the man.) Departments openly discriminated against women for graduate fellowships on the grounds that they would probably get married and have babies. That change came fast.

We weathered and were in fact substantially improved by those revolutions. Despite the public criticism and our internal strife, colleges and universities came out of that tumultuous period essentially intact and retaining public confidence, even though to this day it remains a mystery why we went into the period of so-called campus unrest or why we came out of it. We finally entered into a period in which what happened on our campuses moved off the front page and most of what the public learned about us came from the sports pages.

And what about the crises of the 1990s? They are quiet crises. But they are just as threatening, maybe even more threatening, than those of the turbulent 1960s.

I do want to be careful not to exaggerate. When we are in an up moment we often think that it will never cease, and when we are descending we sometimes extrapolate as if the crisis will never be over.

But even taking all this into account, I believe that today the doors of opportunity are closing. They are closing with little public debate and less public understanding of the drastic consequences for the nation.

Let me be rather specific about my concerns: I am concerned about a drift into mediocrity and the development of a two-tiered system of higher education. I am concerned that higher education is about to follow in the path of our K-12 system. When I was young in the Middle West the only kids sent to private schools were the very rich, the very bad, and the very dumb, because the public schools provided a splendid education. That is no longer true today. What we need to do is to bring the level of K-12 up to the level of higher education. The danger, however, is the drift downward of higher education to the level of K-12.

Although I worry about the entire range of higher education, I am most concerned about research universities and, within that community, about the public research universities. These are the ones most under attack.

I come to this disheartening conclusion because of several trends, national in scope, that threaten our system of higher education.

First is the chronic underfunding of higher education, which is likely to become more acute. The fiscal problems facing higher education today are more serious than those we faced during the Great Depression.

These problems are also likely to be more persistent than those of sixty years ago. In state after state, constitutional arrangements and federal mandates are such that a high percentage of a state budget is allocated before legislators or governors can make a single decision about how the state's revenues should be spent. In many states the battle is between higher education and prisons, and as some wit has pointed out, it is a zero-sum game, with the prisons getting the sum and universities and colleges getting the zero. And the problems are getting worse: a RAND study in California points out that without some major changes in state financing within ten years, by the year 2002 there will be no general funds available for higher education. I suspect that similar conditions are to be found in other states.

What is happening in state after state is that we are gradually abandoning the conviction that the social interest in education is sufficiently important that the taxpayer can appropriately be asked to keep the cost of instruction for all students low and the quality of public higher education high. In many states, taxpayers no longer seem willing to provide the indispensable core funding for higher education.

One way of making the problem clear, though it is rather an oversimplification, is to see the several income streams that provide for higher education in the United States. Students and their parents put up some of the funds. Students can, and many do, apply for loans and grants, and those are chiefly provided by us as federal taxpayers. We also provide, as federal taxpayers, funds that support most of the research effort—especially basic research and graduate instruction. As state taxpayers, we provide most of the cost of undergraduate instruction and direct instructional costs. As users we pay for residence halls and auxiliary enterprises. As graduates and donors we provide for museums, endowed chairs, and the like—what we in higher education like to call the margin of excellence.

All these streams, except private giving, are drying up.

Congress is debating how to cut student financial aid—not if it should be cut, but how and by how much. As the cost to students goes up, the time will come when low-income and middle-income students may lack the resources to go to the college of their choice—or even to college at all.

The second trend is in some ways related to the first. A tidal wave of criticism is engulfing higher education, from journalists, public officials, business people, and observers of higher education of every stripe and persuasion. The list of complaints is long and, if you are a college or university president, painfully familiar. There is no vision in higher education, the critics say, no long-term planning, no coming to terms with

the changed fiscal environment facing higher education. In particular, there are no proposals for fundamental change in the large research universities. And the remedies proposed are familiar: require professors to do more teaching and less research, bring business methods into higher education, get rid of unnecessary schools and departments and specialties, force students to get through school faster, and move more quickly toward computer-aided instruction and other methods of distributing knowledge.

There is something to be said for these propositions. Many of them are already being examined and most of them are being implemented. Some of them seem to me to miss the point, such as the assumption that research and teaching only occur at the expense of each other, when every survey we have done at the University of California shows that more than 70 percent of our students believe they have received a good to a great education in our research-oriented environment—a record unrivaled by most human institutions, including marriage.

We will never purge our institutions of all their human and organizational imperfections, and I'm not even sure it would be a good idea if we could. What worries me is not the existence of criticism. What worries me is the ultimate effect on the public perception of higher education at a time when public confidence and understanding are critical to its survival. By and large our students are getting an excellent undergraduate education, and our colleges and universities are doing an outstanding job under terribly adverse circumstances. Yet the critics of higher education seem to have captured public attention and the public imagination. People seem eager to believe that their system of higher education, still the envy of the world despite massive budget cuts, is wasteful, inefficient, and ineffective, and its leaders intent only on protecting their perquisites and privileges. If the result of this critical onslaught were workable ideas for improvement or

reform, the gain would be worth the pain. Unfortunately, much of the criticism of higher education today is dramatically overstated, venomous in tone, and bereft of genuine solutions. And it is coming from people with tremendous influence on public perception and public policy.

The third trend I want to mention could be called the illusion of the quick fix.

One version of this is the idea that, if we develop the right kinds of strategic plans, we can figure out how to bridge the gap between the resources being made available for our colleges and universities and what it costs these institutions to educate students and support the research structures in medicine, engineering science, social sciences, arts, and humanities. It is a matter of vision and will, it is said, and the determination to make those fundamental changes in the American university which must be made to make it more efficient and effective. Obviously the job won't get done without will and vision and a lot more. Clearly the future will be different from the past and those among us—including especially some of our faculty—who believe that all we have to do is duck our heads and wait for the criticism to abate, that we can go into the future without making some fundamental changes, are wrong. But even with the best planning and will in the world, we won't get to where we need to be without the minimal resources to pay the costs of educating the next generation. There is no way higher education can manage or plan itself out of its current budgetary straitjacket. Public colleges and universities have made enormous efforts, with some success, to increase support from private and other alternative sources. They have reluctantly raised student fees. They have also made draconian cuts in libraries, laboratories, the maintenance of campus grounds and buildings, and, most of all, in their people. There is no more fat to be cut.

I am also skeptical of claims that fundamental reorganization of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

way teaching and learning take place will save higher education. Higher education has been successfully adapting to change longer than most other institutions in the western world. Yet the act of learning and the art of scholarship have remained much the same. Students and teachers will continue to need to get together. Learning, now and in the future, is something each of us must do often by ourselves and for ourselves. The essential functions universities perform have remained intact over the centuries and will remain so into the future. Nor will the virtual university—a shorthand term for the use of informational and other technologies to substitute for the traditional labor-intensive process of teaching and learning—rescue us from our financial problems. Informational and similar technologies offer wonderful possibilities for expanding the scope and efficiency of teaching and research. We are experimenting with some of those possibilities within our universities. Such technologies are not cheap, however, and the initial investment is the least expensive part of it. Nor will technology make the traditional classroom obsolete. The invention of the library didn't make professors obsolete; it just gave professors and students another tool for learning.

I also note that when people talk about delivering education more cheaply and efficiently, it is usually the education of other people's children they have in mind; their own deserve only the best four-year residential experience. It reminds me of the mass transit situation in New York. Some years ago New York officials decided that a subway ride in their city would never cost more than the traditional nickel. They stuck to their decision despite rising costs and deteriorating subway conditions. The result is that today the middle class uses taxis and leaves the dirt and danger of the subways to the poor.

The fourth and final trend is internal to higher education itself.

Fiscal and other problems have put tremendous pressures on the decision-making machinery of universities. Universities operate on the principle of shared governance among the administration, the faculty, and the board of trustees. It is complex, ponderous, and sometimes maddeningly slow, but history has shown that universities don't work unless all three partners in the academic enterprise agree on important issues, and shared governance is designed to build such agreement. It is a system that runs on consultation and consensus and, most important, on mutual respect for the balance of authority and responsibility among the faculty and administration on the one hand and the board of trustees on the other.

Today that system is being called into question. We are seeing not just isolated examples of a breakdown in shared governance, as sometimes happens in times of crisis, but a breakdown in the belief that shared governance ought to be the way universities are run. Ironically, the challenge is coming not from efficiency-minded outsiders but from boards of trustees themselves.

A serious form of the problem is the tendency among boards to regard recommendations from the president or chancellor as merely one among several competing recommendations from various constituencies—students, alumni, concerned citizens, and so forth. In reality, the responsibility of the president or chancellor is to consult with various constituencies—faculty, staff, students, alumni, and external publics—prior to bringing a recommendation to the board. By the time a recommendation is presented to the boards it has typically been through an elaborate consultative process. Such a recommendation, appropriately, should come to the board with a very strong presumption that it will be supported. Of course the tough questions should be answered and the president's or chancellor's recommendations sometimes turned down, if that is the sense of the board. But

shared governance assumes that a recommendation from the president or chancellor isn't just one among others; it is a recommendation from those who have been vested with the responsibility for running the institution. For the board to send such a signal radically undermines the authority of the administration and the faculty and would make it extraordinarily difficult for them to bring tough or controversial recommendations. Such a method of governing would not work in the best of times. In times of crisis or budgetary stress, when painful decisions have to be made, it would be impossible. This is an especially threatening development, given the urgent need for colleges and universities to deal with so many external problems and challenges. Higher education must set its house in order if it is going to address them with any hope of success.

So what are we to make of this diagnosis, if it is accurate? What is to be done beyond moaning and groaning and complaining that nobody understands us?

First, I think we have to recognize that the solution is "all of the above" and that there is no silver bullet. We live in a democracy and it is necessary to make your case. But we also have to take corrective action.

I believe we have to move on four fronts:

• We have to improve our efficiency in managing the scarce resources entrusted to us. I do not think it is accurate to portray higher education as being operated by an inefficient bureaucracy of fuzzy-minded college professors who don't understand modern business techniques. On the contrary, I think our colleges and universities are well managed. Nonetheless, there is the need for us to continue our day-by-day review and improvement of everything we do from teaching classes to mowing the lawns. And I do not think that how we do teaching or engage in research can be immunized from review. We have to provide better instruments for

accountability, better ways to measure our performance, better measures of outcome.

We have to review our priorities. We must make choices and develop processes for doing so that will better ensure that we spend our scarce resources on those items that matter the most. Of course, any time we talk about what matters the most, the question is, to whom? What the professors think is most important? They must play a central role, but it cannot be a decisive one. What the students think is most desirable? The trouble is students tend to take the short view, since for most of them higher education is a chapter in their history, not the place where they will spend the rest of their professional lives. What the administrators think? They are obviously central too, but their eye is often on the bottom line, not academic priorities.

• We must focus on academic quality. I have long believed that every administrative decision should be made with the following in mind: Will this help a student learn? A professor teach? A new perspective or intellectual discovery to come to light? In the 1980s, many of us got used to solving problems by addition—adding programs, positions, buildings. In the 1990s, we have got to figure out how to prune so that we don't dilute the quality of what we do. It is tempting, but it would be a great mistake, to keep admitting students beyond the capacity of our colleges and universities to give them a good education, or to keep academic programs of marginal quality because it's easier to do than to make the tough decisions.

• We must either find new sources of support for higher education, or new ways of persuading the taxpayers to return to their historically generous support of higher education. To be candid, I am skeptical about the first

possibility—finding new sources of support. In California, where higher education has taken a fiscal battering in the past four or five years, private giving is at its highest level ever. That's the good news. The bad news is that private generosity can't begin to bridge the gap left by declining state support and cutbacks in federal funding that are sure to be enormous. No, I think we must find a way to convince the taxpayers that the money they spend on higher education is a real investment and that it pays real dividends.

• One way to do this—for research universities, anyway—is to step up efforts to put the brainpower of the faculty to work by accelerating the transfer of new knowledge to the marketplace. This has two advantages: it generates extra revenues for universities and helps stimulate economic growth. We've stepped up our technology transfer efforts at the University of California, and over the past five years total revenues from UC patents have nearly tripled, making UC by far the most successful program in the country in terms of income. Of course this needs to be done with due regard to the academic missions of universities and their need for open discussion and sharing of results, and we've been careful to build in safeguards as we've expanded our program.

These are the reactionary thoughts I wanted to share with you. The crises of the 1960s had, by and large, happy endings. Maybe, despite my pessimism, the crises of the 1990s will too, but surely not without some thoughtful self-scrutiny on the part of higher education.

I want to close with the words of another midwesterner, a good friend and a great man—Roger Heyns. A few years back he spoke on the problems facing colleges and universities, and what the times demand of us.

This is what he said: "There must be a renewed sensitivity to the needs of the university itself, a dedication to the welfare of the institution itself, and a willingness to subordinate one's own desires, or those of one's group to the common interest. Unfortunately these are not pronounced tendencies among us, and the years of relative affluence . . . did not strengthen them."

It may be that after the crises of the 1960s, the constraints of the 1970ss, and the affluence of the 1980s, the challenges of the 1990s will bring us together at last in a new and deeper commitment to the enterprise of higher education. If we ask for a model of that kind of enlightened dedication to the common interest, we need look no further than the man for whom this distinguished lecture is named. David Dodds Henry was truly someone who understood and encouraged the pursuit of the common good in spite of our tendencies to do otherwise. He was one of the heroes of higher education, and we can all profit from his example.

Response by James D. Anderson

Professor, Educational Policy Studies,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

President Peltason has delivered a very straightforward and disheartening message regarding the state of higher education in America. The central problem is the chronic underfunding of higher education, which in his view is likely to become more acute. But there is a deeper and more disturbing problem. The ethical foundation of public higher education has eroded significantly over the past three decades. Historically, taxpayers, public officials, business people, and journalists and other spokespersons held to the conviction that the social interest in education was sufficiently important that the public could appropriately be asked to provide the core funding for quality public higher education. Peltason reminds us that in state after state taxpayers are gradually abandoning the conviction that higher education is sufficiently important to merit the public's traditional sacrifice and in many states taxpayers no longer seem willing to provide the necessary funding for higher education. This development might be far less disheartening if the citizens stood alone in their doubts about the social interests of higher education. All other things being equal, we might attempt a reeducation of the citizens by public officials, business people, the media, and, of course, the emergent group of public intellectuals.

However, there is a second trend that is fundamentally linked to the taxpayers resistance or indifference to the social interest of public higher education. Many public officials, business people, and journalists are themselves part of the tidal wave of criticism that is now engulfing higher education. The critics of higher education have captured a disproportionate

share of public attention. Further, and more important, they have captured the lion's share of political power, and today they dominate public policy. This alliance between taxpayers who are no longer willing to provide the core funding for higher education and public officials (as well as business people and journalists) who are among the leading critics of higher education, constitutes a major force against higher education at a time when public confidence and support are critical to its survival. Indeed, higher education is trapped between an indifferent public and a hostile leadership. This appeared to me to be the central message of his address. It is straightforward and persuasive and based on a wealth of experience in higher education.

The main question or challenge seems obvious. What can we do to survive and eventually overcome this crisis? I found it both interesting and instructive that President Peltason, having observed over the past three decades various efforts to save higher education, is convinced that many of our most cherished solutions have very limited potential to resolve the current crisis. Drawing upon a tradition of flexibility and resilience in higher education, many of us have thought that strong leadership and vision, fundamental reorganization and strategic planning, and, of course, technology would rescue us at least from our most pressing financial problems. To be sure, President Peltason believes that all of these solutions are important. However, for him, they are necessary because higher education must set its house in order to enlarge its opportunity for success. These are not solutions to our financial crisis. He says clearly that the best planning and will in the world will not get us to where we need to go without the core funding necessary to educate the next generation: "There is no way higher education can manage or plan itself out of its current budgetary strait acket."

President Peltason suggests that we move on four fronts to resolve our current crisis. The first three— efficient management of scarce resources,

a continuous review of our priorities, and a focus on academic quality—are all necessary to place our house in order, but as he stated, will not rescue us from our financial crisis. The fourth front calls for us to either find new sources of support for higher education or new ways of persuading the taxpayers to return to their historically generous support of higher education. Frankly, he does not believe that we can find sufficient new financial support to bridge the gap left by declining state support and potential cutbacks in federal funding. Hence, even as we are encouraged to find new sources of support, ultimately there is only one solution to this crisis. We must find a way to convince the taxpayers that the money they spend on higher education is a real investment and that the outcomes of higher education are worth the sacrifice. President Peltason suggests that one way of doing this is to step up efforts to put the brain power of the faculty to work by accelerating the transfer of new knowledge to the marketplace. I suspect, however, that as a distinguished political scientist he knows that it is going to take much more than that to reestablish among taxpayers the ethic and conviction that they should tax themselves more to provide the core funding for higher education.

The important point is that he has set the parameters of the broad debate. This is unfamiliar territory for higher education. We do not have the kind of historic relationship with the public that permits us to influence its thinking about the value of higher education. Normally, we would rely on public officials, business people, and journalists to make our case to the public. But this time we find ourselves in a position where they are more likely to be our critics than our advocates. What kind of leverage do we have, particularly leverage that the public cares about, other than the transfer of new knowledge to the marketplace? Can we engage the public directly in this kind of appeal without compromising our tradition of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

institutional neutrality? Would the political representatives of "no new taxes" ideology view efforts by us to persuade taxpayers to increase their support of higher education as a counterpolitical campaign? Would we then be acting like the state senate?

With a passing interest, I have observed efforts by the mayor of Chicago to raise funds to renovate Soldier Field to keep the Chicago Bears in the city. The mayor refused Monday to rule out new taxes to fund a Soldier Field renovation, and sidestepped questions about how his proposed $150 million deal would be financed. As Mayor Daly got his proposal ready at City Hall meetings, the Civic Federation, a business-based tax-watchdog group that generally opposes new taxes, said political leaders should consider raising taxes to keep the Bears happy. William Hudnut, the federation's president and a former mayor of Indianapolis, said a number of tax increases should be considered, including increases in hotel and motel taxes, to help finance the Solider Field reconstruction or to build a new stadium. I think the whole nation may be aware of the conditions of public education in Chicago. It is instructive that the Civic Federation has not called for new taxes to improve the quality of public education in the city.

Of course, we do not have the option of moving UIUC to northwest Indiana. But the question is nonetheless critical. What kinds of partnerships can we establish with Illinois taxpayers that will convince them that the money they spend on higher education is a real investment and that they should further increase the taxes on themselves to provide the core funding for higher education? If the only real and long-term solution to our financial crisis is to persuade taxpayers to restore their historically generous support of higher education, then the question is not whether we should travel this rocky road, but when and how while maintaining the autonomy of the institution and academic freedom for its faculty, staff, and students.

Response by John E. Cribbet

Professor of Law Emeritus, Chancellor Emeritus
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

I begin my brief response to Jack Peltason's insightful remarks on the "Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary" by what is, in reality, a footnote. The tributes to President Henry are exactly on target and I incorporate the sentiments by reference without duplicating them. I add only that I was the youngest member of the search committee which recommended Dr. Henry to our then Board of Trustees. The committee was constituted differently in those days and I was selected by the old faculty senate (a kind of House of Lords) to represent those faculty members under 35. Thus, you see, I rather bask in the reflected glory of having played a small role in what turned out to be a very wise choice. Much later, President Henry appointed me dean of the College of Law, thus confirming my confidence in his good judgment. In fact, I began my twelve-year tenure as dean at the same time that Jack became the first chancellor of the Urbana-Champaign Campus. By then, Jack was too ancient to be the "boy chancellor," but he didn't exactly have a gray beard either. (End of footnote.)

When Stringfellow Barr was president of St. John's University, he said that the trouble with the present generation was that they had not read the minutes of the last meeting. I suppose that aphorism is true of every generation, but it seems particularly appropriate today when we seem determined to retrace paths already taken and ignore the lessons of the past. Jack's remarks skillfully remind us of some of those minutes so far as higher education is concerned. For Jack, and so many of us in the post-World War II generation, these are not really minutes, they are current events, still vivid

in our minds. One of the uses of an education from the days of Henry Adams to Clark Kerr and beyond has been to make the past less opaque for succeeding generations. No easy task!

From past experience, I know that Jack and I share at least one characteristic—we are both eternal optimists—at least we were. In the period of student unrest, Jack could whistle while strolling through a graveyard. Thus, I am sorry to hear him say, "I regret that I am ending my academic career on such a pessimistic note, but I am comforted by the fact that throughout history the older generation tends to believe that the world is going to hell." Of course, I can understand that shift in mood when one's last position was president of the University of California in 1995. Jack ought to extend his career long enough to end it as a political science professor emeritus. The current student generation would do much to restore his normal balance. Things look much more hopeful from the classroom podium than from the administrative suite. I liked Jack better as a revolutionary than as a reactionary!

Of course, Jack is basically right — there is much to be pessimistic about these days. But wasn't there always? In any case, it isn't just higher education that is under critical attack. All institutions of society, even the legal system for heaven's sake, are taking their lumps. Suddenly, we, as a society, don't seem to agree on much of anything. Even the past isn't what it used to be. What has gone wrong? I think it is the lack of an external enemy that can, more or less, pull a diverse society together. The Great Depression, World War II, the Cold War, even Vietnam in its early stages, made us appear to be more united than we really were. Now our enemies have changed, we have become more aware of the internal cracks in the fabric of our polity and we have not yet learned how to deal with the new condition of things. One of my favorite authors, Barbara Tuchman, in *The March of*

Folly writes of how America betrayed herself in Vietnam. In a sense, we are still suffering from that and other betrayals as we search to locate different kinds of enemies in the light of an approaching new century. God knows there are more than enough candidates, but they are going to be more difficult to deal with than the evil empires of the past. Henry Adams said it better than I can: "From cradle to grave this problem of running order through chaos, direction through space, discipline through freedom, unity through multiplicity, has always been, and always must be, the task of education, as it is the moral of religion, philosophy, science, art, politics, and economy." One of the uses of an education, then, is to start us on the lifelong search for those elements of simplicity which alone can explain the chaos of complexity.

Several years ago, I heard Henry Kissinger speak to the American Bar Association in Toronto. After stating how pleased he was, as a political scientist, to be talking to a large group of lawyers, he opined: "The difference between lawyers and political scientists is that lawyers find solutions to problems; political scientists find problems with the solutions." Reversing the flow, I find no problems with Jack's solutions to the higher education dilemmas and I agree that there is no "silver bullet," but I think his diagnosis is too pessimistic and puts too little faith in the next generation. Jack, our generation didn't look so hot to our parents and grandparents either, but we haven't done too badly on our watch and I'll bet that the fresh new faces we see on the campus will provide some solutions to the problems you have outlined so well. They won't solve all of them of course because then the generation after that wouldn't have anything to do. Despite some pundits, we do not live at the "end of history." Indeed, perhaps we are witnessing another beginning for higher education in the United States, one built on the firm foundation laid by our predecessors. After the Allies drove the Nazis

out of North Africa, Winston Churchill said: "This is not the end, it is not even the beginning of the end, but it is the end of the beginning." Let us hope that the same may be true of the vast educational enterprise to which we have devoted our professional lives. Now, how do we convince the taxpayers that the money they spend on higher education is a real investment and that it pays real dividends?

Response by Eldon L. Johnson

Vice President Emeritus, University of Illinois

It is a pleasure to be working with Dr. Peltason again, reminding us of the "good old days—well, most of them. Then there were the bad ones, as he here remembers with his customary objectivity on those disruptions of the late 1960s. What better time and place then this for us all again to salute him for his service at the center of the maelstrom on this campus. In retrospect, of all the debated styles of leadership (and how does one lead in a maelstrom?) his choice of the nonconfrontational was wisest, even with the clever use of a little planned ambiguity.

Whatever else we conclude about this period, it must be regarded as an unprecedented challenge to American higher education. It forced a stop, look, and listen on the very nature of the university, its proper mission, and the necessary and acceptable (repeat, acceptable) means of achieving it. It forced institutional self-analysis and a rethinking of all that we had been taking for granted. I call that an unwanted good thing—so good that we ought to be doing it all the time and so unwanted that we hope similar challenge will be unnecessary.

This major threat to university autonomy in the 1960s, says Dr. Peltason, has turned in the 1990s to some new threats—sometimes, strangely enough, from trustees, those to whom the university's autonomy has been literally *entrusted*. Happily, trustees are like all of us, combining holiness and cussedness, and sometimes acting without consideration of the consequences. They and all in the university community are in need of this admonition: Whatever power you enjoy was conferred for the good of the university; therefore, use it only to that end. The unforgivable abuse of

power is exhibited by the trustee, appointed or elected, who uses his or her access to the inside to promote inimical political interests outside. We need more trustees like the Yankee farmer who had been appointed by the governor, himself a puppet of an antiuniversity newspaper. A reporter from that paper asked him, trying to preempt the answer, "Since you were named by the governor, would you vote against him on the big issue in the next trustee meeting?" The answer was a resounding, "Hell, yes, and be sure you quote me!" But with all its faults, the trustee system is like democracy, better than any alternative—that is, for providing not only essential public accountability but also institutional autonomy and academic freedom.

Now I come to Dr. Peltason's and our chief worry: "the chronic underfunding of higher education," with the ominous result that "today the doors of opportunity are closing." It is that regrettable reversal of history that I want to address.

Doors are closing, I must add, both because of the legislative financial shortfall and the university imposition of higher and higher tuition. We are the accomplices in what we lament. Sometimes the solution of one problem creates another even worse. So with tuition increases, they make money—what else, pray tell?—but they have the negative effect of closing doors to educational opportunity. Why are we so stressed out about racial and religious barriers but not about economic barriers? The answer in all areas is to stop tilting the playing field of opportunity.

Hence, I want to emulate that professor who had a dream that he was lecturing to a class, awoke, and sure enough he was. In *my* dream there is a university which says to the public and its legislators, you can go so far with appropriations but no farther with tuition increases, no more letting you off the hook, no more taxing education as just another marketable commodity, and no more contrived formulas to justify the unjustifiable. So

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

please, Dr. Peltason, help us. Do we reduce enrollment, cut programs, lay off faculty, stop free public services, abandon all but teaching, whomp up the self-deception of more loans to "learn now and pay later" in our new collegiate form of indentured service; or shall we, better yet, use a combination to generate a special fund for free tuition to all youth who would be admitted by equality of access but barred by inequality of income? When I awake from my dream, into the real world of governments and universities, I am sure I will find that university representative resigned, fired, or dead, but I would salute him at his funeral. I use this parody to make a point. Witness two headlines: in an alumni journal, "Is This a Public University Any Longer?" and in a newspaper, "For a Child Born Today, College Costs Could Exceed $100,000 in a Public University." Unconscionable!

We ought to be ashamed, in a so-called *open* society, that we are widening the gap between the privileged and the underprivileged, when our worldwide record is already dismal and getting worse. The respected British journal, *The Economist*, recently reported an analysis showing that not only has America indeed produced an underclass, but that we are now putting its members more and more under.

Dr. Peltason is to be thanked for his helpful insights from a remarkable academic career. But what do we do about all of it? I can readily second his conviction that there is no quick fix. But I will hazard a guess, that as a political scientist, he would see one possible approach in the use of the political processes and "the bully pulpit," as Theodore Roosevelt called it. The public university needs to devise a strategy to bring higher education back to its historic roots and to rebuild public confidence in education as the engine of democracy, as Jefferson wrote. It needs, for example, to make more allies (like public schools, community colleges, and the myriad powerful groups served); answer quite positively those asking the seem-

ingly negative but answerable question, "What have you done for us lately?"; strengthen awareness of modern society's utter dependence on knowledge-based institutions and trained intelligence; and elicit the aid of all the great professions which can be legally practiced only by university graduates.

If this sounds too daunting, we should nevertheless press on in the knowledge that inadequate support of public higher education comes from lack of will, not lack of ability. That will, that order of priorities, *can* be changed. And above all, if we still need inspiration and confidence, we should return to the crowded halls of the campus and look into those real faces of the future.

Response by Sylvia Manning

Vice President for Academic Affairs, Professor of English
University of Illinois

I want, of course, to get to the substance—or at least some small part of it—of what Dr. Peltason has offered us this afternoon. But I have been mesmerized, as it were, by an incidental comment, a number, and if I don't acknowledge it I shall have trouble getting beyond it. He spoke of 45,000 speeches, at a rough but probably conservative estimate, on the subject of higher education made annually by presidents, chancellors, and deans. The number 45,000 is mesmerizing enough, but what rivets my attention is the thought that it could be a lot worse, there could be a lot more.

Many years ago, in the nascent period of my life as a university administrator, I attended a meeting of provosts. The group was just small enough to digress agreeably from time to time, and one digression had to do with the definition of the title "provost." That title was just beginning to compete with vice president (or vice chancellor) for academic affairs, and people inside as well as outside the academy were curious about it. Even in the military the title is infrequent, and why would we have chosen a military title, and from the military police at that? One person offered the fact that the oldest known use of the title was for the keeper of the king's horse, suggesting that such a person would probably have carried a large shovel, and that a modern-day provost might also carry a shovel, for a similar purpose. Another knew the term from *Ivanhoe*, where it is apparent that the provost was a sort of lesser bailiff—the bailiff keeping order, like an umpire, when the knights jousted, and the provost doing the same for the less classy tournament of yeomen. But the definition that carried the day

was functional. The provost, said this participant, should be understood by role: the role of the faculty, this person said, is to think; the role of the university president is to make speeches; the role of the provost is to make sure that the faculty don't make speeches and the president doesn't think. Without our provosts, imagine how many times 45,000 speeches we would have.

Let me start seriously from a late point in Dr. Peltason's address. He spoke, with appropriate gloom, of the competition higher education—in most states, all of education—is under for state funding. He mentioned the competition with prisons, and in most states the full list is longer. In Illinois, which is fairly typical in this regard, it includes in addition to prisons, public aid, mental health, and aid to families and children (Illinois's Department of Children and Family Services is responsible for an astonishing 50,000 foster children). In contrast to education, education at all levels, what these areas have in common is that their need for funds seems absolutely compelling because all the agencies involved are occupied in fixing something human that is broken. People commit crimes; people suffer mental disorders; people are ill and poor and cannot afford medical assistance; people abandon or are unable to take care of their children. By law or out of fear or out of our best humanity, we cannot deny the funds to fix these problems. And having directed money to fix these problems, the state finds its coffers closer and closer to empty, and so there's little money left for education, our only known hope for avoiding the same problems in the next generation.

Education builds people right in the first place so that they have the ability and the will to care for themselves, to see themselves as within the social group, to love and raise their children. Less education for the populace as a whole means fewer jobs, fewer skilled citizens, poorer health

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

habits, more illness, more crime, a weaker economy. The state's budget reflects a downward spiral, in which the compelling need to fix what's broken threatens to prevent us from building the same thing right in the first place next time.

I want to suggest that the budget stringency we feel in higher education is not, at least at the state level, an outgrowth or a symptom of the mean-spiritedness that Dr. Peltason pointed to in the criticism that higher education is receiving from public leaders and opinion makers. I agree that the venom is there, and the absence of genuine solutions, but I also think that there may be a causal relationship between those two conditions: that is, that the absence of genuine solutions breeds a degree of frustration that feeds the venom. When people think they have solutions, they become advocative, perhaps evangelical; when they are desperate, they become venomous. States are cutting back support for higher education in large part because they don't know what else to do.

Perhaps there is some denial in my analysis, but it does help us reconcile the decline in state funding support and the public criticism of higher education with an apparently contradictory phenomenon, which is not only the continued high satisfaction ratings we are getting from most of our students, but also the continuing, in some places even increasing, pressure on admissions to selective colleges and universities. People may complain about our leading research universities, but they sure keep fighting to get us to admit their freshman sons and daughters.

Of course, after we admit them they are very unhappy about paying for the privilege. Not that the costs aren't high, especially for those just above the line of financial aid eligibility. But the battle for financial assistance from the sector that could, albeit with some sacrifice, afford to pay (and does pay, after all is said and done or not done) can be disheartening,

even deleterious to one's faith in human good will. And the outcry against increases in tuition charges has become automatic, indifferent to actual amounts of money, needs, price rises, or anything else. Two weeks ago I presented to the University of Illinois Board of Trustees various data preparatory to the board's decisions next month on tuition and fee charges for the coming academic year. My favorite slide—though no one else's, I must admit—tracked U of I tuition increases, as percentages, over the past seven years against the percentage price increases over the same period of America's best-selling automobile. The tuition increases run parallel but lower. Now a resident of Illinois who wants to attend a first-rank public research university as an in-state student has only one place to go, so in that degree the U of I has a captive market we could conceivably exploit. But no one has to buy that car: they could buy no car or one of several other cars. Yet for seven years they have gone on buying that car, with its steady price increases -- and they haven't complained publicly about the price increases and the newspapers haven't made headlines over them.

Higher education is apparently seen by the general public as essential for its young people, but what we recognize as justified to pay for it seems distinctly limited, and seems something lower in the scale than the right car.

Maybe. Maybe not, though. Maybe the attention we are getting, even when it is enraged attention, is finally positive. I am reminded of a colleague commenting upon all the unfavorable attention scholarship in the humanities has received lately, from William Bennett and Lynn Cheney to the *New York Times*, which in its eagerness to mock the papers read at the conventions of the Modern Language Association of America took to reporting them the day before the meeting. Imagine, though, said my colleague: people, regular people, are talking about deconstruction and

multiculturalism, and lots of them are mad about what we're doing, which means, good heavens, that they actually care what we are doing! Surely it beats indifference.

People care what we are doing and in their caring they admit better than they could through any protestations that what we are doing matters. Because it matters, we must continue to find ways both to explain it better than we have to the public that supports us and to do it better, to stick faster than ever to our standards of quality while somehow shedding a certain visible pride in that quality that others perceive as a sort of priestly elitism. And while we think soberly on the signs around us that Dr. Peltason has pointed out, we must also seek to retain the optimism he claims to be losing, in the hope that we will work our way through these difficult times under other leaders in higher education who will emulate his thoughtfulness and equal his achievements.

Chancellor Aiken: I would like to thank each of our four panelists for their very thoughtful presentations. In just a moment we're going to turn to a question-and-answer period, but I wanted to give Dr. Peltason a chance to respond before that if he so chooses.

Dr. Peltason: I won't transgress further on your time because I do want to get to your questions. I want to just use the occasion to thank my colleagues... and to make two points, not intending to try to argue with them, but just to be sure that I'm not misunderstood on the points that I've made. One, I am a great believer that the independent lay board of control is absolutely essential and indispensable to the well-being and health of American higher education. It is one of our great social inventions, and nothing I said should be taken to suggest any criticism of that system of governance. And secondly—I hope we have a chance to talk about it— I also want to be clear, I believe that maybe the most critical question before us at the moment is whether or not these big public research universities will be allowed to raise their fees, although it would be wonderful if the state legislature would provide enough money so that we could provide a low-cost education for everybody regardless of their need. Since I do not anticipate that is likely to happen, unless we get funds by raising the fees for those who can afford it and using that money then to provide financial aid for those who cannot, we will drift into mediocrity. So I think that public policy debate needs to be entered into. I do not think that Eldon's dream or my dream were somewhat different. His dream, I think, might be my nightmare. The university would be locked into not getting the taxpayers' dollars, not being allowed to raise the fees, and gradually the institution would cease to provide quality

education. I think we would not serve our students, or their parents, if the only thing we are interested in is keeping the out-of-pocket costs low. So I think we have to think of new ways to provide the financial aid to those who need it, but not necessarily to ask the taxpayers to provide the money for those who could afford to invest more in their own children's education. That idea is a public policy debate I don't want to necessarily get into here, but my comments were not intended to endorse the notion that raising the fees is necessarily the worst possible alternative.

CHANCELLOR AIKEN: Thank you. I'd like to now open the floor for any questions you might have of Dr. Peltason or any of the four panelists. There are three microphones in each of the three aisles. Would you please state your name and indicate the person to whom your question is addressed and then the question.

DAVID EISENMAN: I am very pleased to be here because both Jack Peltason and David Henry took chances on some of my wilder ideas at different times, and David Henry never got burned by it, but Jack did and yet he still seems to be willing to take a little chance on me. Two years ago Jack gave me the opportunity to speak to the regents of the lay board of the University of California. I had just come off experience on a lay board, that of the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, so the issue of the affordability and opportunity that we offer people in higher education in this country is one that I have struggled with ever since Jack asked me to raise money for Project 500 in 1967.

He gave me an assignment that I've never, never quit working on—not, I would say, with a lot of luck. I guess my question really is addressed to the panel, but perhaps particularly to Dr. Peltason and Dr. Johnson. Can

we not see something good in the bad of what has happened to our country in the last fifty years? The underclass that we are facing at the moment is a real problem. The spread in the distribution of income is what we are struggling with. The way I tried to put it in my question to Dr. Peltason was, "Did anybody hear me?" What I said to the regents of California was that my observation—looking back from 1948 to now, the immediate post-World War II era of the G.I. Bill to the 1990s—was that, just as then, people in the lower income half of the United States are no more able to pay one cent of tuition now than they were then. They may be able to pay a little bit more of the room, board, books, and travel, but by and large people with family incomes in the high $30,000's and on down aren't ready yet to peel money out to pay for what we offer. They may be able to get their kid here, but they can't pay for what we do. On the other hand, as a recent article two weeks ago in the *New Yorker* indicated, the top 40 percent of the American population have continued even since 1973 to see steady gains of real income.

The question is, isn't Dr. Peltason right that it's time to take back into the university the responsibility for affordability, instead of allowing the state to have agencies that provide scholarships, which increasingly are dying? Shouldn't we be saying, "If we admit you we'll work with you to find a way for you to afford it?" Which doesn't, as Dr. Johnson suggests, imply keeping the price low, the list price, but only making the net price affordable, which is what need-based financial aid combined with moderate tuition used to do. That is the question.

Elson Johnson: I don't apologize for my impatient plea. It was deliberate to make the point. I said it's unconscionable to be talking about the cost of educating a child born today at $100,000. And I think we are fooling

ourselves if we think that just having a "learn now, pay later" through student loans is going to solve the problem. It salves our conscience. It doesn't solve the problem at all. And I agree fully with Jack that I expected this, as a matter of fact that this is a highly debatable point. But again, I guess the bottom line, as far as I'm concerned, is— I've seen it over and over in my own experience in an institution somewhat like this state university— is that what we do so readily to make up the shortfall is an invitation to have more and more shortfall. We're letting the legislature off the hook. They're not making the case as to why they ought to do more and more of it.

Linda Perkins, Associate Professor, Educational Policy Studies: I saw a recent prediction that into the twenty-first century they're projecting a massive closing of colleges, not universities, primarily colleges, for a variety of reasons, much of which you have mentioned. Enormous increasing unaffordable costs have allotted people to go and also the change in the public's attitude toward higher education. People are more into high tech now. I just read an article about the decline in the liberal arts and general classics, for example, and those kinds of courses that people no longer even take. Do you see that as a cause for alarm or do you think that is hyperbole?

Di Pelfason: As my colleagues pointed out, I don't see a diminished demand for education. I think people still want that for their children. I think that is the number one thing that they aspire for. I don't think our product is now no longer wanted. My concern is not that the universities won't be here, but will they provide the quality education for large numbers of people. The University of Illinois will be here, the University of California will be here, the buildings will be here, there will be people here teaching, there will be students here. The question is: Will we be able to provide the

35,000, whatever the number is, students here with the kind of quality of education and choices and options they now have? We can do it cheaper, but I think that would shortchange the people. So, as I say, the concern is not that the institutions will close or that there won't be people there, but that we'll get to a two-track system.

LINDA PERKINS: Right, I wasn't speaking about the U of I in these types of instances, but lesser institutions, smaller and poorer institutions that may not survive into the twenty-first century.

DR. PELTASON: Well, in any one year there are always a hundred institutions closing and another hundred institutions opening. The United States isn't finished. The demand for education, I think, will get bigger and better, and that is one of the great things about our system, that there are the opportunities to start new. I do not see a great diminution in the numbers or variety of education.

DIANNE PINDERHUGHES, Professor, Department of Political Science: I wanted to ask a political scientist question. You talked a bit about the role of boards of regents and I could not resist asking you to comment a bit on the University of California's Board, which recently rejected the University's Affirmative Action program despite the support of yourself and all of the chancellors of all the nine campuses. I just thought I'd offer you the opportunity to comment on that.

DR. PELTASON: Well, as I said, I find Dr. Henry's desire not to make any comments after I'm out of office. I will tell you what I said when I was in office. The Board of Regents—the issue came up, I don't know how many

times; this is a very complicated subject. I recommended, as did the chancellors, as did the academic council, a careful review of our practices, some of which needed to be corrected and we corrected them. But I felt that what we were doing was not only just and fair, but absolutely made for a better quality education and that no change should be made, and I vigorously made that argument to the board. I think the board made a mistake, but I did not fault the board for carrying out its responsibilities. It was making policy. It was not trying to micromanage a university. It is a big policy issue before the American people, and the people's views on it are different sometimes than those of us inside the academy. We've made the case; we lost. But I do want to emphasize that the board did reemphasize its commitment to diversity, charged the university administration and the faculty to expand its outreach efforts.

Working with K-12 to improve the eligibility of minority students so there would be more of them eligible to come to the University of California did not deprive us of the opportunity to take into account factors other than test or grade points in admissions practices. This was a debate over a public policy, and boards are supposed to set policy. I wish they'd agreed with me; they didn't. I'm not one who accused them then or now of somehow doing something that a board shouldn't do. On the issue, I think they made a mistake, but I don't think this was an inappropriate intrusion of the board. I'll always remember the time when I was a young, vice chancellor at Irvine, and right after the Board of Regents—in those days every twenty years the board does something like this— I told my successor, "You've got twenty years now you know." In those days they fired Clark Kerr, one of the greatest people in higher education. The board made a big mistake, but had a right to do it. We had a meeting of the academic senate, and one young man wanted to get up with a resolution to tell the regents to keep their

hands off the internal affairs of the university—something you can't tell the regents. They listened to us; we had six weeks of debate, thirteen hours of debate. They heard us; they didn't agree.

VIRGIL WIKOFF, Illinois State Senator: As a nonacademician, I might throw out a comment that is not news to Jack, but having spent a little time in the legislature, we only saw the university and a few people come appropriations time. You have a viable product to sell, you have thousands of alumni. When public aid came down for appropriation, there were hundreds of people in evidence. The legislature, like anyone else, will listen to people if you have a viable product. And you do have one, but you need to sell it.

DR. PELTASON: Let me use the occasion to also acknowledge Virgil Wikoff's leadership roles of the 1960s. At a time of great public impatience with us, he and the other elected officials of Champaign-Urbana exercised tremendous restraint in helping us work our way through that. Virgil and I spent lots of hours in police stations and other places together. He also has provided great public service in the legislature. Let me just also comment, I don't think that legislators of the public have made a conscious decision that they don't like higher education. What has happened is that other issues have crowded the public agenda. The claim upon the dollars that are available has gotten so that we are now getting crowded out, and we have to be more effective in making the presentation of our case. That is what I meant by saying we live in a democracy, and if you live in a democracy you've got to gom out there and argue your case. I think we have to be more effective. Some of us remember with nostalgia—these are times for reminiscing, I hope you all don't mind, but a lot of you in the room are old enough to be in that stage with me—remember the good old days, Virgil, when

Senator Peters, all he had to do was go down to Springfield and say, it's my institution, take care of them. And that was our effective presentation. Now they have analysts over there giving them advice — frequently people who have just been denied tenure at the University of Illinois. But we do have to make our case more effectively.

ROBERT SPITZE, Professor Emeritus, Agricultural Economics: President Peltason, it's good to have you back in our midst. Among many issues that you've touched on that are dear to many of us and the faculty, one was the future of the land grant idea. I think I heard you say we need to modernize it, and you didn't have time obviously to elaborate. Would you give us two or three more sentences on what your thoughts are on that very important topic?

DR. PELTASON: Well, as I have said on other occasions, all of us from a land grant tradition have used agriculture as the model that we need to emulate into the next century, where, from basic knowledge at the University of Illinois's campus—from the basic scientists in chemistry to agronomy—it was a continuous change to the producer. So there is a constant flow of knowledge being produced at the University and then quickly given to the person out on the field. Everybody thought it was proper and appropriate, and we worked out all of the ethical and financial problems, and it was thought to be what a university was supposed to do, get that information out. Well, now as we move into the next century where knowledge is being distributed by high tech industry, low tech industry —how do we get that continuous flow of knowledge out there? There are a lot of problems to be worked out; universities are beginning to work on it. There is a lot of tension within the university about the appropriateness. There are a lot of questions

from the general public: "What is that professor doing out here in this plant helping us make widgets?" But I think working out those problems is one of the big issues on the agenda of this and other universities similar to it.

CHANCELLOR AIKEN: I want to thank our panelists today for their very thoughtful comments about Dr. Peltason's speech. But I particularly want to thank Jack Peltason for returning to the campus and for the outstanding speech as the seventeenth David Dodds Henry Lecture. I think his comments and his assessment of higher education today have been very thought provoking. I think that it will give us all a lot of thinking to do in the coming months. So with that, I would like to end this session. Thank you.

"The Administration of Higher Education in an Era of Change and Conflict," by Clark Kerr, October 1972

"Can We Maintain Quality Graduate Education in a Period of Retrenchment?" by David Riesman, April 1975

"The Administration of Education for the Health Professions: A Time for Reappraisal," by John R. Hogness, April 1976

"The Education of Administrators for Higher Education," by Harlan Cleveland, April 1977

"Socially Imposed Costs of Higher Education," by Howard R. Bowen, April 1978

"Quality and Equality in Health Professions Education and Service," by Lloyd C. Elam, April 1979

"How We Talk and How We Act: Administrative Theory and Administrative Life," by James G. March, September 1980

"The Liberal Arts Revisited," by Hanna Holborn Gray, October 1981

"The University Presidency: Comparative Reflections on Leadership," by Martin A Trow, October 1984

"Innovation and Tradition in Higher Education," by John B. Slaughter, October 1985

"Mandate for a New Century: Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy," by Donna E. Shalala, October 1989

"The New American University," by Frank H. T. Rhodes, October 1990

"Beyond Conservation and Liberation: The Education of Our Aspirations," by Linda S. Wilson, February 1992

"(R)evolution in American Higher Education," by Donald N. Langenberg, December 1992

"Higher Education and the Concept of Community," by Alexander W. Astin, October 1993

"The Public University of the Twenty-First Century: Beyond the Land Grant," by Walter S. Massey, October 1994.

"Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary," by J. W. Peltason, October 1995